DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 859 HE 009 425

AUTHOR Neff, Charles B.
TITLE Possibilities for Faculty Development.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; *Higher Education; Presidents; School Surveys; State Surveys; *State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *State University of New York

ABSTRACT

Data are reported that allow assessment of the possibilities for faculty development. The main source of data is a survey administered within the State University of New York, through which presidents, faculty leaders, and other faculty members expressed opinions about the value of a number of faculty development activities and assigned priorities among them. A statistical analysis of the survey results and a bibliography are included with the narrative report. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146859

Possibilities for Faculty Development

By

Charles B. Neff

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles B. Neff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE009425

Possibilities for Faculty Development

The purpose of this article is to report data which assesses the possibilities for faculty development somewhat more fully than they have usually been assessed.[1] The main source of the data is a survey administered within the State University of New York in response to which presidents of diverse institutions, faculty leadership and faculty membersexpressed opinions about the value of a number of faculty development activities and assigned priorities among them.

Background

As one might expect in an area that is still quite new, there is considerable difference of opinion about what faculty development means. One school of thought emphasizes instructional development. Although this viewpoint to some extent evinces concern for the effective needs of students, by and large it suggests that faculty development means doing the job of teaching more effectively. For a second group, faculty development means human development. A number of fascinating techniques are being tried which encourage the faculty member to look upon his whole career and to examine his development as a person as well as a professional. New institutional means for supporting the human development of faculty members are also being discovered. A third approach focuses on the management of the steady-state--better use, shifting, and, in some cases, elimination of existing resources. The threads of concerns, ideas, and techniques are being spun out. So far the design of the resulting professional

and institutional fabric is not yet fully discernible.[2]

Perhaps we can advance a tentative definition. "Faculty development" basically refers to ways (techniques, programs) of maintaining and improving faculty personal and professional vitality in a time of reduced resources--and of doing so with adequate attention to student needs, institutional viability and resource availability. Faculty development will be one of our responses to continuing professional needs of faculty as well as to the interests of new clienteles, changing student preferences, and tighter budgets.[3]

It's probable that a successful faculty development program will be more than a single activity. It will have to be multiple in intention and design, responding to a range of instructional, human and management concerns in a way that is appropriate for each local situation. Especially in large and diverse institutions or among consortia, the best aim may not be for one program, but instead for a number of faculty development programs designed for the particular strengths, objectives and needs of individual teachers and scholars.

Even if the resulting programs are appropriately different, they will probably emerge as responses to common questions. Though the questions are surely more complicated than this brief discussion can demonstrate, these principal ones stand out.

Mission. How does the campus see its mission with relation to the fundamental task of learning? What balance does it seek between the search for new knowledge?

Does it stress general, occupational, pre-professional or professional education, or what combination among them?

Capability and Quality. Given the campus mission, what type of faculty is likely to fulfill that mission most effectively? How does the present faculty fit with the campus mission, with commitments to research, instruction and specialized service? What are the program staffing patterns--appointments, retention, tenure, retirement--anticipated over the next few years? What is the relationship between actual and anticipated academic programs and the staffing pattern?

Emphasis. Should the faculty development program (or programs) emphasize renewal (an increase in effectiveness without change of field or discipline); reorientation (a change of emphasis without a change of field or discipline); and retraining (a change of field or discipline)? What should be the relative emphasis among these three main tasks?

We're most familiar with the task of renewal, though renewal when budgets are reduced will probably mean making different use than we have in the past of sabbaticals, released time, tuition waivers, professional travel, etc. Retraining has important individual consequences, though it is a highly selective and expensive venture. (The Florida system has some experience with retraining. Pennsylvania is launching a major program,

Stanford has a more limited one, and SUNY a small experiment.) Reorientation is numerically the biggest task and may be the one to which we should give the greatest attention. Changes in faculty orientation could include new instructional methods, programs for new clienteles, substitution of more generally-designed instruction in place of specialized discipline offerings. Carefully introduced, each of these changes could simultaneously produce vitality and enthusiasm for a significant segment of the faculty and attract students.

Activities which reflect each of the principle emphases of renewal, reorientation and retraining were listed in the SUNY survey.

Available Evidence

A search of the literature turns up few reports of faculty interest in faculty development. Wick surveyed over a thousand faculty members at seventy institutions and found that professional career-oriented motivation was stronger than teaching-related motivation. She also found that faculty were more interested in faculty development activities which related to their disciplines than they were in more broadly-defined programs. However, Wick's results may in part be forecast by the options she provided respondents: her list of activities primarily was limited to traditional professional tasks, plus a few others relating to teaching improvement or evaluation.[4] Bess has constructed a conceptual scheme on potential new roles for faculty, many of which imply necessary developmental activities. He does not report any such activities in progress or preferences among them.[5] Wattenbarger and Carpenter report 1974 survey results on administrator and faculty preferences for instructional competency evaluations

and for the activities to accomplish them. Since their survey was conducted among community colleges, their results reflect a particular instructional orientation which may be more characteristic of those colleges than of other types of institutions. However, their findings of relative congruity between administrative and faculty opinions and the range of activities which both groups would be willing to accept are consistent with the results of the SUNY survey.[6]

The SUNY Survey

State University of New York is a large multi-campus system. Among its thirty-four state-operated campuses are university centers, liberal arts colleges, specialized colleges, agricultural and technical colleges and medical centers. In addition, State University provides program coordination and review for thirty locally-sponsored community colleges.

In the fall of 1975 and the early spring of 1976, answers to the questions on the attached questionnaire (Appendix A) were solicited from selected groups in SUNY. The first group was the University Faculty Senate with 47 members from which 28 useful replies were returned. Actually, the survey was first given to the Senate with the intention of using it solely with that group. Thereafter, it seemed worthwhile to solicit other opinions as well. A mailing was made to the sixty-four presidents of State-operated and community colleges. From that group 51 responses were returned, including 34 from State-operated and 17 from community college presidents. Then to achieve some balance and round out the sample, the questionnaire was also sent to the members of the Council on Community

Colleges, where out of 30 members, 23 questionnaires were returned. Finally, a random sample of faculty at a four-year college (the College at Brockport) and at a community college (Hudson Valley Community College) was surveyed, with 51 responses out of 100 received from Brockport, and 71 out of 100 from Hudson Valley. (For convenience these groups will henceforth be referred to as the "regular" faculty.)

The resulting sample of 241 members of the SUNY community is so structured that we can comment upon and compare the attitudes toward faculty development of the administrative leadership of the University (presidents), faculty leadership (Community Council and Faculty Senate), and faculty members who are not part of either group.

Some general parameters

Three general questions (questions C.1., C.2., and C.3.) near the end of the questionnaire solicited opinions about level of organization, priority and emphasis of faculty development programs. A summary of the opinions of the six principal groups is presented in Table 1. [Display Table 1 about here.]

With regard to priority, it's apparent that 80% or more of all groups feel that faculty development programs are of moderate or high priority. Regular faculty and presidents seem more inclined to see it as a high priority. This is especially true of four-year faculty. By contrast, faculty leadership assigns faculty development a more moderate priority.

With regard to the level at which faculty development programs should be organized, there is more of a difference of opinion. No

Table 1

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE * TO QUESTIONS C.1., C.2. and C.3.

	Community College Faculty (N = 71)	Four-year Faculty (N - 51)	Community College Faculty Leaders (N = 23)	Four-Year Faculty Leaders (N = 28)	Community College Presidents (N = 17)	State-Operated Presidents (N = 34)
For faculty development programs, Priority is: (Question C.2.)						
High	35	65	26	29	53	50
Moderate	48	24	52	61	35	32
Low	14	6	13	7	6	9
Do not start	1	6	4	4	6	3
Organization should be: (Question C.1.)						
University-wide	4	8	4	7	6	6
Regional	4	4	13	4	0	3
Separate campus	37	26	30	32	47	44
Program	14	18	9	11	6	0
All Levels	39	39	39	43	29	38
Emphasis should be on: (Question C.3.)						
Retraining	1	2	4	4	0	0
Reorientation	9	12	9	7	6	9
Renewal	37	24	35	25	29	37
A combination	51	55	44	61	65	50

*Responses add up to less than 100% because No answer or Don't Know responses have been omitted.

groups feel that faculty development should be organized principally at the University-wide or regional level. A small but significant group of faculty, especially regular faculty, would like to organize the programs at the program level. The most interesting division is between a fairly substantial number of respondents in each of the groups which wants faculty development organized on a campus basis as opposed to almost an equal number which would like to see faculty development programs organized at all-University levels. (This finding should lend support in a non-system context to consortial, as well as campus, activities). The faculty, whether regular or leadership, narrowly favors all-level organization over separate campus organization. The presidents put more emphasis upon separate campus organization.

As to the emphasis of faculty development programs, fewer than 15% of each group would emphasize retraining and reorientation activities alone. The single most popular choice is for traditional renewal programs. Both faculty and administrators are in agreement on that point. However, the largest response, a majority in all cases except that of community college faculty leaders, is for a program which combines retraining, reorientation and renewal.

The substantive responses

The main body of the questionnaire allowed the respondents to rank 25 possible faculty development programs on the basis of their actual or potential "worthwhileness." Additionally, they could choose from among these 25 programs the three that they felt were of highest priority. The list of 25 potential activities was drawn up from a variety of sources--from reports of activities already occurring within SUNY (either as a result of traditional practice

or of new developments), and from reports of faculty development programs throughout the United States.

Collectively these activities represent a kind of smorgasbord of possibilities. They can be put together in a variety of ways into an overarching program of faculty development. Many of the activities are those with which faculty or administrators have had considerable experience. Others represent departures from usual practice.

In order to arrive at judgments which reflect both preference (worthwhileness) and priority, we have combined the mean scores for each of questions 1-25 with the means of the priority scores for each question (assigning a value of 1 for first priority, 2 for second, 3 for third, and 4 for no mention). The rank order of the combined scores should give us an approximation of the real ranking of the various activities, i.e., what is desirable as well as what would be given priority. The only problem with our methodology is that it tends to bunch scores within a very narrow numeric limit with the result that differences may be artificially compressed. For that reason we have listed only the top five and bottom five items for each respondent group. We have reasonable confidence that scores at the extremes represent genuinely favorable or unfavorable choices while scores toward the middle range are relatively more interchangeable. The responses are compared in Tables 2-8 by role, type of institution, and length of service.

[Insert Tables 2-8 about here.]

Points of agreement

1. First of all, one can't help but be impressed by the fact that all activities are deemed worthwhile by a majority of all the

TABLE 2

	Total Sample (N = 241)
	Rank
Most Popular	1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)
	2. Summer grants (Q.9)
	3. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plan (Q.15)
	4. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10)
	5. Workshops on instructional techniques (Q-7)
Least Popular	25. Regional group for faculty development(Q.17)
	24. University-wide function for faculty development(Q.18)
	23. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19)
	22. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25)
	21. Academic year released time (Q.5)

TABLE 3

	Administration (N = 87)	Faculty (N = 150)
Most Popular	Rank 1. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10) 2. Personal and professional development plans (Q.11) 3. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16) 4. Committee on faculty development (Q.1) 5. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plan (Q.15)	Rank 1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16) 2. Summer grants (Q.9) 3. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15) 4. Funds to support research (Q.23) 5. Workshops on instructional techniques (Q.7)
Least Popular	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17) 24. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19) 23. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25) 22. Academic year released time (Q.5) 21. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17) 24. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18) 23. Personal and professional development plans (Q.11) 22. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19) 21. Facilitating consultant to the faculty (Q.2)

TABLE 4

	Community College Faculty Sample (N = 71)	Liberal Arts College Faculty Sample (N = 51)
Most Popular	Rank	Rank
	1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)	1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)
	2. Workshops on instructional techniques (Q.7)	2. Support for research (Q.14)
	3.* Summer grants (Q.9)	3. Funds to support travel (Q.23)
	3.* Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15)	4.* Grants for general education courses (Q.6)
	5.* Grants for general education courses (Q.6)	4.* Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15)
	5.* On-campus faculty seminars (Q.13)	
Least Popular	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)
	24. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)	24. Academic year releasted time (Q.5)
	23. Support for research (Q.14)	23. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)
	22. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)	22. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25)
	21. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25)	21.* Facilitating consultant to the faculty (Q.2)
		21.* Colleague tutoring (Q.4)

* Tie.

TABLE 5

	Community College Council (N = 23)	Faculty Senate (N = 28)
Most Popular	Rank	Rank
	1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)	1. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15)
	2. Summer grants (Q.9)	2. Summer grants (Q.9)
	3.* Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15)	3. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)
	3.* Academic year released time (Q.5)	4. University fund for retraining (Q.24)
	5. Funds to support research (Q.23)	5. Funds to support travel (Q.23)
Least Popular	25. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19)	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)
	24. Personal and professional development plans (Q.11)	24. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19)
	23. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)	23. Student evaluation of teaching (Q.12)
	22. Facilitating consultant to the faculty (Q.2)	22.* Facilitating consultant to the faculty (Q.2)
	21. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)	21.* Personal and professional development plans (Q.11)

* Tie.

TABLE 6

	Community College Presidents (N = 17)	State-Operated Campus Presidents (N = 34)
Most Popular	Rank	Rank
	1. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10)	1. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10)
	2. Committee on faculty development (Q.1)	2. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15)
	3. On-campus faculty seminars (Q.13)	3. Summer grants (Q.9)
	4. Colleague tutoring (Q.4)	4. Campus plan for faculty staffing and program change (Q.3)
	5.* Personal and professional development plans (Q.11)	5. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)
	5.* Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16)	
Least Popular	25. Academic year released time (Q.5)	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)
	24. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19)	24. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18)
	23. Support for research (Q.14)	23. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25)
	22. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17)	22. Academic year released time (Q.5)
	21. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25)	21. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19)

* Tie.

TABLE 7

	Persons Eleven or More years at SUNY (N = 95)	Persons Five or Fewer Years at SUNY (N = 53)
Most Popular	Rank 1. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16) 2. Sabbaticals tied to faculty development plans (Q.15) 3. Summer grants (Q.9) 4. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10) 5. On-campus faculty seminars (Q.13)	Rank 1. Review of performance of all faculty (Q.10) 2. Free tuition within SUNY for developmental study (Q.16) 3.* Grants for general education courses (Q.6) 3.* Summer grants (Q.9) 5. Workshops on instructional techniques (Q.7)
Least Popular	25. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17) 24. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18) 23. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19) 22. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25) 21. Academic year released time (Q.5)	25. Increase SUNY awards (Q.19) 24. Regional group for faculty development (Q.17) 23. Reallocation of campus resources for faculty development (Q.25) 22. University-wide function for faculty development (Q.18) 21. Meetings of disciplinary or professional groups from several campuses (Q.22)

* Tie.

Data is also available on those 6-10 years at SUNY (N=89). For that group the most popular activities are also described by questions 16, 9, 6, 15, 7 ; and the least popular by questions 17, 18, 2, 25, 14 and 11.

TABLE 8

RANK ORDER BY GROUPS

Questions	Administrator	Faculty	Four-yr. Pres.	CC Presidents	Faculty Senate	CC Council	Four-yr. Sample	CC Sample	Less than 6 yrs.	6-10 years	More than 10 yrs.	Total Sample	Range	Spread
1	4	9	8	2	11	9	15	5	7	9	7	8	2-15	13
2	12	21	13	9	21	22	20	20	11	23	20	20	9-23	14
3	9	16	4	10	10	16	16	10	8	13	9	10	4-16	12
4	20	12	20	19	13	7	20	17	16	12	19	18	12-20	8
5	22	15	22	25	18	3	24	11	19	15	21	21	3-25	22
6	10	6	6	13	16	6	4	5	3	3	11	7	3-16	13
7	7	5	10	4	9	10	14	2	5	5	6	5	2-14	12
8	12	19	11	14	17	11	18	16	15	18	13	16	11-19	8
9	5	2	3	10	2	2	7	3	3	2	3	2	2-10	8
10	1	8	1	1	7	15	6	8	1	8	4	4	1-15	14
11	2	23	9	5	21	24	17	19	9	20	15	15	2-24	22
12	11	17	7	7	23	16	13	13	9	11	18	12	11-23	12
13	8	7	12	3	6	12	11	5	12	7	5	6	3-12	9
14	17	17	14	23	14	19	2	23	20	20	17	19	2-23	21
15	5	3	2	12	1	3	4	3	6	3	2	3	1-12	11
16	3	1	5	5	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1-5	4
17	25	25	25	22	25	21	25	25	24	25	25	25	21-25	4
18	21	24	24	18	20	23	23	24	22	24	24	24	18-24	6
19	24	22	21	24	24	25	10	22	25	19	23	23	10-24	14
20	16	13	15	20	12	16	8	12	17	14	14	13	12-20	8
21	15	14	17	17	15	13	12	15	18	16	12	13	12-18	6
22	18	11	19	15	8	8	18	14	21	17	10	16	10-18	8
23	19	4	17	16	5	5	3	9	14	6	8	9	3-19	16
24	14	10	16	8	4	14	9	18	13	10	16	11	9-18	9
25	22	20	23	21	19	20	22	21	23	22	22	22	19-23	4

respondents, and 17 out of 25 or 80% or more of the respondents. So it seems there is considerable openmindedness about a variety of possibilities for faculty development, some of them tried and true, many of them not yet tried and therefore of unknown ultimate value.

2. The responses dispel some myths. Faculty, like administrators, seem ready to engage in evaluation of performance as part of faculty development. There seems no inclination on anyone's part to make faculty development an additional activity which is dependent on granting more released time. On the whole, there is no clear dividing line between "administrative" solutions to the needs of the faculty, and those which would clearly be called professional, though where differences exist, they do deal with important issues.

3. When it comes to priorities for faculty development, there is still considerable flux among all groups. Out of the 25 potential activities, all were named as first, second or third priority by at least five individuals. Not one single activity was listed in first, second and third priority (combined) by as many as 30% of the respondents.

4. Despite the apparent randomness of priorities among all activities, certain clusters of activities are more widely accepted than others. Free tuition for professional development within SUNY was almost everyone's favorite choice. (Cynics might say that such a choice ranks high because it has the virtue of being something for nothing, or at least very cheap. The same response, viewed positively, demonstrates, though, that all groups view

the internal resources of the University as an excellent resource--perhaps its own best resource for encouraging faculty development.) The most traditional activities--sabbaticals, summer grants, seminars--are more generally popular than newer, organizationally, or externally-related activities.

5. For all the openmindedness about the worth of the suggested faculty development activities, and the willingness to assign some of those activities a fairly high priority, there is still considerable reluctance on the part of all individuals to say that faculty development is of a sufficiently high priority to be given resources through reallocation from other programs. The last question on the list which deals with resource reallocation was deemed worthwhile by only 60% of the respondents overall, and even more significantly was assigned second or third priority (no firsts) in the scheme of things by only 13 persons out of 241.

Differences

Tables 2-6 reveal few major differences among the groups. Table 6, which depicts the rank ordering of all items may be the most helpful in giving the reader perspective on the items which appear in the "top five" and "bottom five" choices of each of the groups in Tables 2-5.

1. Most of the cases where there is a wide spread in the rank order among the groups, i.e., ten or more places dividing their responses, can be attributed to a single deviant case which probably is out of line as much because of the methodology employed as anything else. This comment applies to the differences in responses to

questions: 10 on review of faculty (deviant response, community college council); 14 on research support (deviant response, four-year faculty sample); 15 on sabbaticals (deviant response, four-year presidents); and 19 on teaching awards (deviant response community college council).

2. In other cases where ten or more places in rank order separate the groups, a more evident pattern emerges.

a) Question 11 on individual faculty plans (sometimes called "growth contracts") clearly produces the most pronounced disagreement. Administrators like the concept and faculty do not; younger faculty might tolerate the practice more readily than those more senior. Question 11 is the only one which appears in some lists among the "top five" (administrators, community college presidents) and the "bottom five" (faculty as a whole, faculty leadership). Note, however, that apparent opposition to this particular practice does not mean that faculty are opposed to periodic evaluations.

b) Questions 1 and 23 are the only other issues which show salient differences. Faculty are less enamored of another committee than are administrators, and four-year college faculty less than their community college counterparts. Retraining, on the other hand, is more popular with faculty than with administrators, and more important to the four-year colleges than to the community colleges.

3. Other questions--number 2 on on-campus consultants; number 14 on research; number 19 on teaching awards--are low enough in rating so though the differences appear real, they also do not seem important.

4. Questions 6, on grants for new courses, and 7, on workshops, show differences but with no consistent pattern.

Conclusions

The data discussed in this paper does not provide any hard and fast conclusions about the future of faculty development activities. It does, however, allow us to make some guesses about future trends and about the needs for further programmatic refinement if faculty development is to become a genuine movement in American higher education.

1. Sanford, Freedman, Katz and other have pointed out that the faculty, the interrelationships among its members, the willingness of the faculty to absorb new ideas and to test them in programs like faculty development, are all facets of the academic culture.[7] Any successful faculty development program must be thoroughly attuned to the nature of that culture, to its communication patterns, value systems and rewards. Some faculty development efforts, e.g., the interviews at the Wright Institute, the creation of faculty consultants, the establishment of faculty-run faculty development centers, are attempting to describe that culture or to explore ways by which change can gradually be induced from within. Important as these efforts are, they become more valuable to the extent that they take into account the fact that the faculty culture is shaped not only by its internal elements, but especially in these days, by powerful forces as well.

Our data shows that the faculty culture seems willing to contemplate a variety of programs and strategies and this conclusion seems to hold true for most major groups within the University. There is, however, as yet no clearly defined pattern of commitment. The openness to change is there, the sense of how the change should be shaped is not.

Furthermore, most of the programs or activities which seem most acceptable are those which steer rather closely to traditional modes of faculty renewal, though there is evident openness to more radical programs as well to retraining or more to means for reorienting the faculty to new tasks. As long as faculty development programs stay rather close to conservative comfortable means, they will probably find fairly wide acceptance. There may even be some willingness to accept more directive programming, e.g., linking sabbaticals to approved faculty development plans, as long as the directing is done carefully and with attention to potential resistance.

What is not clear is what will happen to the apparent willingness of faculty and local administrators to accept faculty development efforts if these programs appear as the ideas of central administrations or state budget offices or legislative examiners. The evident willingness to think of a range of faculty development programs could be replaced by resistance and defensiveness, perhaps taking the form of more militant unionism. (That unions need not always take positions against faculty development pro-

grams even if the directive variety is indicated by the agreement between the Pennsylvania State College System and its union, whereby a trust fund has been established for faculty retraining.)

2. The next era of faculty development, if it is to have broad effects, must be one of much more careful specification at the local level. Questions of mission, current faculty training, and future faculty needs must receive answers specific enough to produce some form of limited agreement on what types of programs among the range of those available could be started on any particular campus.

3. Finally, there is the all-important question of resources. It seems clear that for all the general support for faculty development, there is no real willingness to shift resources to its activities at the current time. This doesn't mean that resources cannot be shifted, or cannot be redirected, e.g., new ways of defining sabbaticals, released time, and tuition waivers. But it does mean, given the general condition of State and Federal funding and the high probability that no large new investments in higher education are likely to be made over the next decade, that faculty development must come from internal reallocation of funds. The small amount of external funding that comes from foundations like Lilly, Kellogg and from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education will not be enough to sustain a major effort and may not be continued beyond some experimental projects.

Reallocation is going to require two things simultaneously: inventing new administrative means for investing a portion of an

institution's resources in internal research and development of the faculty; and explaining that process in such a way that the means will be acceptable within the academic culture.

The first task really ought not to be so difficult since there are numerous models from research-intensive industries in the United States which could serve us well. A comparison with industry along those lines, incidentally, is quite appropriate and should not be confused with management comparisons which are sometimes made without sufficient regard for differences in the two types of organization. Surely there should be no more attractive alternative to the faculty than finding some sustaining way to provide ongoing support for renewal, reorientation, and retraining. But we do need to find ways of explaining what parts of the industrial model can properly be adapted to a university, and much care in seeing that the means by which they are adapted are consistent with some of the basic values of the academic culture, most particularly academic freedom.

It will be in the context of merging the institutional prerequisites of the next decade with those of the faculty member as a functioning professional that the second of the two tasks will be accomplished. Then a number of more specific faculty development programs may emerge, a possibility which our data suggests could, WITH SUFFICIENT RESOURCES, be readily accomplished.

Footnotes

1. The very term faculty development seems to create problems in some circles. As used here, it refers to programs especially applicable to instructional faculty. Some prefer the term professional development because the term seems to imply that others (librarians, resource center directors, deans, business officers) also should develop or improve. Despite the more limited focus of this paper, I am very much in accord with broader, institutional development efforts, rather than with strategies which are limited to the faculty per se. For an interesting discussion of the terminology of faculty development, see Mary Lynn Crow, "Emphasis on Faculty Development" in Mary Lynn Crow et.al., Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities, Souther Regional Education Board, 1976.

2. The perspective of instructional development is reflected in item #42 in the bibliography at the end of this article. Item #17 reflect the human development approach and item #24 concern for the steady state.

3. Gaff offers this definition: "(faculty development) may be defined as enhancing the talent, expending the interest, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors. With the decrease in faculty mobility, it appears that faculty members will remain at one institution for a longer period of time, they will look to that institution to provide the opportunities and support for their own professional and personal development, and current faculty will have to play a key role in maintaining institutional vitality." Toward Faculty Renewal, Jonsey-Barr, 1975, p.

4. Margaret Wick, "Indicators of College and University Members' Willingness to Participate in Faculty Development Activities," 1976 (mimeographed). Available from the author, Briar Cliff College. Wicks' results are in part forecast by the options she provided her respondents: the activities list included primarily traditional professional activities and teaching improvement or evaluation.

5. James Bess, "Academic Reorganization through Faculty Role Specialization," a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1975.

6. James L. Wattenbarger and Robert S. Carpenter, "Faculty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initiative," Community College Review, Vol. III, No. 1, June 1975.

7. For instance, Nevitt Sanford, "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development," Soundings, Winter 1971; Jerry G. Gaff, "New Approaches to the Improvement of Instruction." A paper delivered for a symposium on instructional faculty and organizational development, AAHE, Chicago, March 24, 1975 (mimeographed); Joseph Katz, "The Challenge to 'Body of Knowledge' Learning from Person Centered Advocates," Liberal Education, May 1972.

APPENDIX A

A SURVEY ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

A. and B.	Mean Worthwhileness	Mean Priority
1. An active campus committee on faculty development	1.83	3.63
2. An on-campus consultant to the faculty who assists (facilitates) in development programs but is not involved in evaluation for promotion or tenure	2.22	3.77
3. A campus plan relating a faculty staffing pattern to anticipated program changes	1.87	3.81
4. A program (summer or academic year) for faculty to tutor colleagues, trading skills and knowledge on an each one teach one basis	2.20	3.69
5. More released time during the academic year for planning new courses	2.22	3.78
6. Grants for the creation of new courses, especially of a general education or interdisciplinary nature	1.74	3.66
7. Workshops run by experts on instructional improvement techniques	1.80	3.53
8. More support for and more extensive use of the Instructional Resource (Educational Communications) Center	1.97	3.88
9. Summer grants to support course development or study of a new field	1.51	3.53

SURVEY ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

	Mean Worthwhileness	Mean Priority
10. A periodic review of the performance of all faculty, tenured or not	1.66	3.49
11. The requirement of a personal and professional development plan for each faculty member	2.20	3.63
12. Student evaluation of teaching for every faculty member	1.94	3.82
13. Regular on-campus faculty seminars which concentrate on the improvement of teaching or the sharing of knowledge	1.68	3.70
14. More support for research	2.17	3.81
15. Granting sabbaticals in accordance with approved plans for faculty development	1.46	3.64
16. Free tuition for any study within SUNY which is part of an approved faculty development plan	1.32	3.44
17. A regional group for faculty development	2.64	3.97
18. A University-wide function (committee plus administrative support) for faculty development	2.44	3.95
19. An increase in the number of SUNY awards for outstanding faculty performance in teaching or research	2.44	3.88

SURVEY ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

		Mean Worthwhileness	Mean Priority
20.	An expanded faculty exchange program	1.93	3.89
21.	More opportunities to bring visiting scholars to campus (for short or longer periods)	1.92	3.90
22.	More meetings of disciplinary or professional groups from several campuses	1.98	3.87
23.	More funds to support travel to professional meetings	1.76	3.73
24.	A University fund for faculty retraining	1.89	3.83
25.	Reallocation of campus resources presently used for other purposes to support faculty development	2.32	3.92

C. Please check one answer for each of the following questions.

		Percent
1.	Faculty development should be planned and organized:	
	a. primarily University-wide	5
	b. primarily at the regional level	5
	c. primarily on each separate campus	37
	d. primarily at the program level	11
	e. to some degree at all levels	37
	f. not answered	5

SURVEY ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

		Percent
2.	Faculty development relative to other campus needs, opportunities or problems is:	
	a. a high priority	44
	b. a moderate priority	40
	c. a low priority	10
	d. something which should not be started (beyond what is now being done)	3
	e. not answered	3
3.	Faculty development is most likely to succeed if it emphasizes:	
	a. retraining (a change of field)	2
	b. reorientation (a change of emphasis without a change of field)	9
	c. renewal (increased effectiveness without change of emphasis or field)	33
	d. some combination of the above three	51
	e. not answered	6

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

1. Marvin Adelson, "On Changing Higher Education from Within," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 18, No. 2, November/December 1974.

2. Allen E. Bayer, Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73, ACE Research Report Volume 8, No. 2, 1973.

3. William H. Bergquist and Steven R. Phillips, "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," Journal of Higher Education, March/April 1975.

4. James L. Bess, "New Life for Faculty in Their Institutions," Journal of Higher Education, May/June 1975.

5. J. M. Bevan, "Faculty Development (a Votre Sante)." Davidson College, June 23, 1974 (mimeographed).

6. Robert T. Blackburn and Mary Jo Clark, "An Assessment of Faculty Performance: Some Correlates Between Administrator, Colleague, Student and Self-Ratings," Sociology of Education, Spring 1975.

7. Albert H. Bowker, "Managing the Faculty Resource in the Steady State," in John F. Hughes and Oliver Mills, Eds., Formulating Policy in Post-Secondary Education: The Search for Alternatives, ACE, 1975.

8. Cassette Tapes of the Conference on "Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education" (April 30, May 1, 2, 1974). Available from Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University. Of particular note are John Noonan, "Facilitating Faculty Development"; H. Bradley Sagan, Moderator of a panel on "Comparative Viewpoints on Faculty Evaluation and Development"; and Bert R. Biles, Moderator of a panel on "The KSU Instructional Effectiveness Assessment Program."

9. Arthur M. Cohen, "Work Satisfaction Among Junior College Faculty Members," Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, November 28-29, 1973. Also reproduced by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

10. James I. Doi, Assessing Faculty Effort, Jossey-Bass 1974.

11. S. Garber Drushal, "Institutional Commitment to Faculty Development," GLCA Faculty Development News, November 14, 1975.

12. Kenneth E. Eble, Professors as Teachers, Jossey-Bass 1972.

13. Kenneth E. Eble and the Conference on Career Development. Career Development of the Effective College Teacher, sponsored by the AAC and the AAUP, 1971.

14. Faculty and Staff Development Manual, South Carolina Technical Education System, State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, July 1, 1975.

15. Richard M. Finger, "The Evaluation of University Faculty and Administrators: A Case Study," Journal of Higher Education, November/December 1975.

16. John Bruce Francis, "How Do We Get There From Here: Program Design for Faculty Development," 1974. (Forthcoming in The Journal of Higher Education.)

17. Mervin Freedman, "Facilitating Faculty Development," in Mervin Freedman, Issue Editor, Facilitating Faculty Development, No. 1 in the series New Directions for Higher Education, Jossey-Bass 1973.

18. Jerry G. Gaff, "New Approaches to the Improvement of Instruction." A paper delivered for a symposium on instructional faculty and organizational development, AAHE, Chicago, March 24, 1975 (mimeographed).

19. Great Lakes College Association, Faculty Development Program Bibliography, March 1975 (mimeographed).

20. James L. Hammons, Editor, Proceedings: Conference on Questions and Issues in Planning Community College Staff Development Programs, July 1-3, 1974. Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, June 1975.

21. Gilbert Highet, "The Need to 'Make It New'," Chronicle of Higher Education, June 21, 1976.

22. Harold Hodgkinson, "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators," Educational Record, Fall 1974.

23. Richard L. Hoffman, "A Faculty Investment in a Competence Curriculum: The Mars Hill Experience," and "Faculty Workloads." Mars Hill College, 1974 (mimeographed).

24. Joseph Katz, "The Challenge to 'Body of Knowledge' Learning from Person Centered Advocates," Liberal Education, May 1972.

25. H. R. Kells, Staff Development at Rutgers: A General Analysis of Needs and a Set of Proposals, Office of University Personnel, Rutgers University, December 1974.

26. Raymond N. Kieft, "Faculty Planning Parameters: A Shared Responsibility, College and University, Spring 1975.

27. David J. King, "An Approach to Steady-State Staffing in a Psychology Department," American Psychologist, August 1975.

28. Lynn W. Lindeman, "Why Faculty Object to Accountability in Higher Education," Liberal Education, May 1974.

29. Robert Lisensky, "Resource Allocation as a Vehicle for Change," Liberal Education, May 1974.

30. Warren Bryan Martin, "Faculty Development as Human Development," Liberal Education, May 1975.

31. S. Martorana, William Toombs, David W. Breneman, Editors, Graduate Education at Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development, Technical Report No. 5, National Board on Graduate Education, August 1975.

32. Gerald W. McLaughlin and others, An Investigation of Department Heads at a State University, paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, February 1973, also published as an ERIC document, Leasco Information Products, Inc. 1973.

33. Michael A. Moore, "Purpose or Power: Planning for the Steady State," November 1974. (Mimeographed) (Also, in abbreviated form "Defining and Planning for the Steady State," Educational Record, Spring 1975.)

34. Charles B. Neff, "A Survey on Faculty Development," Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, Volume I, Issue 3, Fall 1975.

35. James N. Nesmith, Editor, More for Less: Academic Planning With Faculty Without New Dollars, Papers presented at a conference sponsored by the Society for College and University Planning and Educational Testing Service. Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

36. Northeastern Illinois University, News Release on NIU/Kellogg Foundation Project on Training Tenured Faculty Members for Non-Traditional Programs, November 25, 1975 (mimeographed).

37. David H. Ost, "Perspective on Faculty Development," Future Talk, Office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges, Spring/ Summer 1976.

38. Richard H. Peairs, Issue Editor, "Avoiding Conflict in Faculty Personnel Practices," New Directions for Higher Education, No. 7, Autumn 1974.

39. Stephen Phillips, "The Many Faces of Faculty Development," College Management, November/December 1974.

40. Report of the Presidential Task Force on Faculty Development, California State University Fresno, March 12, 1975.

41. Clare Rose and Jerry Gaff, "Faculty Development in a Statewide System," Center for Professional Development, California State University and Colleges, 1974 (mimeographed).

42. Nevitt Sanford, "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development," Soundings, Winter 1971.

43. Melvin L. Sharpe, et al, Materials Relating to the State University System of Florida Faculty Retraining Program, Assorted Memos, 1973-1974 (mimeographed).

44. Walter W. Sikes, Lawrence E. Schlesinger, and Charles N. Seashore, Renewing Higher Education from Within, Jossey-Bass 1974.

45. John M. Smart, Editor, The Challenge of Creative Change, Program for Innovation at and Improvement in the Instructional Process, California State University and Colleges, March 1975.

46. "Staff and Program Development in Florida's Community Colleges," 1973-74, Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges, Tallahassee, Florida, April 1975.

47. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment, Change Publications, 1974.

48. William Toombs, "A Three-Dimensional View of Faculty Development," Journal of Higher Education, November/December 1975.

49. University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, "Materials on Faculty Development," 1975 and 1976 (reproduced in various forms).

50. University of Wisconsin System. Faculty Development and Renewal: The 1970's and Beyond, Academic Planning Statement No. 3 (ACPS-3). Approved by the Regents May 9, 1975.

51. Terry H. Wallace, Community College Staff Development: An Annotated Bibliography, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, April 1975.

52. James L. Wattenbarger and Robert S. Carpenter, "Faculty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initiative," Community College Review, June 1975.

53. John L. Zaharis, Developing Guidelines for Faculty Reduction in a Multicampus College, Miami-Dade Community College, Florida, April 1973 (mimeographed and also published through ERIC).

54. Albert B. Smith, Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, Eric/Higher Education Research Report, No. 8, 1976.

55. John A. Centra, Faculty Development Practices in U. S. Colleges and Universities, Educational Testing Service, November 1976.